1

2

3

FILED IN THE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Jun 15, 2020

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

JAY HYMAS, d/b/a DOSMEN FARMS,

No. 4:16-cv-05091-SMJ

5 || FARMS

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RECONSIDER

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, I to X DOES, DAVID L. BERNHARDT, Secretary of the United States Department of Interior, and AURELIA SKIPWITH, Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service,

Defendants.

Before the Court, without oral argument, is Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration on Plaintiff's Motion to Reset Briefing Schedule, ECF No. 154. Defendants seek reconsideration of the Court's May 5, 2020 Order Granting Motion to Continue Summary Judgment Hearing and Reset Briefing Schedule, ECF No. 152. Having reviewed the motion and the file in this matter, the Court is fully informed and denies the motion

The Court issued a Scheduling Order in this case on February 25, 2020. ECF No. 145. On February 27, 2020, Plaintiff filed an *Ex Parte* Motion for Pro Bono

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RECONSIDER – 1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Counsel. ECF No. 147. The Court granted the motion and requested the Federal Bar Association for the Eastern District of Washington recommend pro bono counsel. ECF No. 148. In that Order, the Court expressly cautioned Plaintiff that the Scheduling Order remained in effect and that all parties were expected to comply with the deadlines it set forth. ECF No. 148 at 2. Despite this, Plaintiff failed to file a response to Defendants' renewed motion for summary judgment or to file his own motion for summary judgment by the deadlines set forth in the scheduling order. See ECF No. 145 at 2. Counsel was appointed to represent Plaintiff and appeared on April 30, 2020, after both deadlines had passed. ECF Nos. 149, 150. Plaintiff, then represented by counsel, filed a Motion to Continue Summary Judgment Hearing and Reset Briefing Schedule. ECF No. 151. Defendants opposed the continuance. ECF No. 151 at 2; ECF No. 149. On May 5, 2020, the Court granted the requested continuance.

Defendants seek reconsideration of the May 5, 2020 Order granting a continuance because Defendants' timely response to the motion to continue was being processed at the time the Court's order was entered. ECF No. 154. In their response, Defendants identified Plaintiff's repeated failures throughout this case to comply with deadlines set forth in this Court's Orders or in the Local Civil Rules and noted that Plaintiff had failed to explain those failures. *Id.* at 2–3. Defendants also cited the Court's cautionary language in the Scheduling Order, ECF No. 145,

and Order Granting Plaintiff's *Ex Parte* Motion for Pro Bono Counsel and Requesting Recommendation for Appointment of *Pro Bono* Counsel, ECF No. 148. ECF No. 153 at 2. Finally, Defendants argue that Plaintiff's filing of two new cases, one of which is before this Court, reflects that Plaintiff has abandoned this litigation. *Id.* at 3.

However, each of the facts raised by Defendants, with the exception of Plaintiff's filing a case not before this Court, were known to the Court at the time of the Order granting a continuance. See ECF No. 149. The Court considered these facts when granting the continuance. Further, denying the requested continuance would result in serious prejudice to Plaintiff as it would preclude Plaintiff from both responding to Defendants' motion for summary judgment and submitting his own arguments for summary judgment in his favor. Due to Plaintiff's pro se status at the time of his prior failures, the Court does not find it appropriate to impose such a drastic sanction for failing to comply with deadlines. The Court notes that, as Plaintiff is now represented, any further delays will not be subject to similar leniency. The motion is denied.

18 ||

//

19 ||

20 ||

Briefing Schedule, ECF No. 154, is DENIED.

provide copies to all counsel.

Diffing Schedule, ECT 110. 134, is DEINED.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The Clerk's Office is directed to enter this Order and

Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration on Plaintiff's Motion to Reset

DATED this 15th day of June 2020.

SALVADOR MENDOZA, JR. United States District Judge